



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXXIII, 3.

WHOLE NO. 131.

I.—A HINDU BOOK OF TALES: THE VIKRAMA- CARITA.

This paper is intended partly to serve as a provisional preface to a work which the writer hopes to publish in time, and which will comprise critical editions of the Vikramacarita in all important Sanskrit versions, with accompanying translations and complete commentaries. The writer's intention is to treat as fully and thoroughly as in him lies all the problems that come up in connection with this story-collection,—whether literary, historical or philological in the narrow sense. Not the least interesting or important chapter, I hope, will be the part dealing with later developments of these stories, or of congeneric themes, both in and out of India. The present paper may be regarded, then, as the first part of an introduction to this work. Its aim is to tell briefly what the Vikramacarita is, what place it holds in Hindu literature, what literary, esthetic and moral ideas are dominant in it; furthermore, to give some idea of the original sources on which we are dependent for our knowledge of the work,—the manuscripts, in short,—with especial reference to the different versions which they represent, and the differences between those versions. These differences are very great; they generally amount, in fact, to a complete writing over of the whole work. To describe this matter in detail would require a book rather than an article. I hope to publish such a description some time, but for the present must largely deal in generalities. Furthermore, as to the manuscripts themselves: it would seem mere pedantry to attempt to describe them individually in a scientific way in this article. For such descriptions are of scant

value to the scholar unless accompanied by the actual texts of the manuscripts; and to the non-specialist they would be of no interest anyway. We shall therefore only speak of individual manuscripts occasionally, when one or another of them presents some peculiar feature which is interesting or important in relation to the topic under discussion at the time.

Few story-collections have enjoyed more popularity in India than the *Vikramacarita*.¹ It has come down to us in a number of Sanskrit versions: it is known to have been worked over into several of the modern vernaculars of India, and has been printed in at least three of them,—Hindi, Bengali and Tamil: it was translated into Persian by order of the Emperor Akbar in 1574: and it wandered northward, presumably by way of Tibet, into Mongolian territory, where it is found in a Buddhist form under the name of the Arji-Borji Chan stories. In spite of all this it has been comparatively neglected by Europeans. No European has ever attempted an edition of any Sanskrit version, nor has any Sanskrit version been translated into any European language. Translations have been made into German, French or English of the Persian version,² of one Mongolian version,³ and of one or two Modern Indian versions. But these all differ considerably from the Sanskrit. Some of them—especially the Mongolian—are scarcely to be recognized as the same work. Of the Sanskrit original there are only three or four Hindu editions, most of them now out of print and seemingly difficult of access (I have so far seen only one⁴): they are moreover, I believe, all of one Sanskrit recension, the Southern, which differs materially from the Northern versions.

Most of the current statements about the work are based on the late Prof. Weber's long monograph, "*Ueber die Sinhāsanadvātriṅcikā*", published in the 15th vol. of his *Indische Studien*, Leipzig 1878. This article of nearly 300 pages is indeed at present practically the only printed source of reliable information about the work. Weber gives a detailed account of the

¹ "*Adventures of Vikrama*" is an approximate rendering of the word.

² Lescallier, "*Le trône enchanté*", New York, 1817.

³ Jülg, *Ardschi Bordschi Chan*, in "*Mongolische Märchen*", Innsbruck, 1868. According to Jülg (p. xiii) there exists in MS an unpublished and very different offspring of the same original, in Mongolian.

⁴ *Jivānanda Vidyāsāgara*, Calcutta, 1881. Another appeared at Madras in 1907, but I have not been able to secure a copy.

Jainistic recension, with copious extracts from the original Sanskrit. His work appears to have been hastily done, and is not too accurate in detail. And his view of the relationship of the different versions was, as we shall see, vitiated by certain erroneous postulates. Nevertheless as a *bahnbrechende Arbeit* his work has considerably lightened my labors, and it would be ungrateful not to acknowledge my great indebtedness to it.

The alternate title of the work, *Siṃhasanadvātriṅśakā*, means "Thirty-two Throne Stories". The throne referred to is a marvellous throne supposed to have belonged originally to the god Indra, and to have been presented by him to the famous Vikrama (also called Vikramāditya or Vikramārka).¹ This personage was according to Hindu tradition a king of Mālava (Malwa) who ruled over an extensive part of India, and who founded an era, the so-called Vikrama era (beginning 57 B. C.), which is one of the best-known Indian eras of time-reckoning. In this paper we shall not discuss the complicated question as to what historic basis there may be for the figure of Vikrama. Certainly most of the things told of him are legends pure and simple. The important thing for our present purpose is that he has become a sort of King Arthur of India, who serves as a type of a noble and righteous emperor. The stories of our collection, which tell of the alleged deeds of Vikrama, are represented as told by thirty-two statues (*puttalikā*)² on the divine throne to a much later king of Mālava called Bhoja. Bhoja is with much plausibility identified with Bhoja Paramāra of Dhārā (1010-1053 A. D.). Weber conjectured that our work may actually have been composed at the court of this Bhoja and in his honor: and the suggestion seems by no means improbable, though it would be hard to prove it.

We know nothing as to the authorship of the work. The manuscripts name various personages, some manifestly impossible, and none at all probable. All we can assume as likely is that in some cases the names of the *redactors* of one or another recension are correctly reported by the manuscripts of the particular recension. Thus the Bengal recension is persistently

¹ The two latter forms are compounds, both meaning "Sun of Valor": the form Vikrama is simply a shortened form of the name. The three forms are used quite interchangeably in all texts.

² Whence the work is also called *Dvātriṅśatputtalikā*, or "Thirty-two Statue Stories"; so in Jivānanda's edition.

attributed to a Vararuci, and the Jainistic version to a Ksemaṃkara Muni, of whom we know nothing else. But these names occur only in the colophons to manuscripts of a single version each, and there is no reason for attributing to either of them the authorship of the original work.¹ Of equally little weight for the work as a whole seems to me the statement also found in Jainistic manuscripts that the work was translated from the Mahārāṣṭrī Prakrit into Sanskrit. Possibly the Jainistic version was really a back-rendering from a Prakrit version, now lost: or possibly the tradition is a pure fiction suggested by the fact that certain other well-known story-collections, as the Kathāsaritsāgara and other offshoots of the Bṛhatkathā, were reported to have been based on Prakrit originals. At any rate the question concerns only the Jainistic and dependent versions, not the work as a whole: for the tradition of the Prakrit origin is found only in MSS. of this class. It may be said that the Jainistic version is sufficiently different from the orthodox versions to make it quite likely that there was some such intermediate stage between them.

As to the date of the composition, the likely identification of our Bhoja with Bhoja Paramāra would place it not earlier than the 11th century. There is no internal evidence which in any way makes this unlikely. Quite a number of Sanskrit literary works are alluded to, but most of them considerably antedate this period.²

Before going further we shall summarize briefly the story of the book.³

OUTLINE OF THE STORY.

(*Introduction*). The goddess Parvatī asks her consort Śiva to narrate some interesting and edifying tale: and the god agrees to tell of the noble deeds of Vikrama.

¹ Weber was misled by his MSS. S and C, which as I shall show below, though not at bottom Jainistic, borrowed their conclusions from a Jainistic source, into thinking that the name of Ksemaṃkara Muni occurred in other than Jainistic manuscripts. See p. 264 f.

² The Vetālapañcaviṃśatī must have been known to the author (see p. 254). Somadeva's work, which was perhaps nearly contemporary, is not referred to: neither is Kṣemendra's. Weber's tentative suggestion that the Jainistic version's "Kṣemaṃkara Muni" may be the same as Kṣemendra seems to me scarcely worth recording.

³ The following outline follows in general the Southern recension.

(*Frame Story*). In the city of Ujjayini¹ there once lived a king named Bhartṛhari. His chief queen, Anaṅgasenā by name, was very beautiful, and the king was deeply in love with her.

Now there was at that time in the city a certain very poor Brahmin, who by long devotions won the favor of the goddess Durgā. She appeared to him and offered him a wish, and he asked for exemption from old age and death. The goddess then gave him a fruit, and told him that upon eating it he should become ageless and immortal. But afterwards the Brahmin regretted his choice : for, he reflected, he could only be consigned to an eternity of poverty. So it occurred to him that he could do no better service to mankind as well as to himself than by giving the fruit to the king : for the king was noble and generous as well as rich, and would be sure to do much good to humanity if he were ageless and immortal. The Brahmin therefore took the fruit and gave it to Bhartṛhari.

But the king reflected that if he should become immortal himself, he must outlive Anaṅgasenā : and being so deeply in love with her, he could not endure the thought. So instead of eating the fruit he gave it to the queen.

But it happened that Anaṅgasenā had an intrigue with one of the servants of the royal household ; and she preferred to give the fruit to her lover. In the same way it passed through several other hands, and finally was brought again to the king. When he recognized it Bhartṛhari summoned his consort, and swearing a great oath forced her to confess. When he had traced the whole history of the fruit, the good king was so overcome with sorrow and disgust at the faithlessness of human beings in general and women in particular that he lost all interest in worldly affairs and determined to become a forest ascetic. So he abdicated his kingdom, and his brother Vikrama reigned in his stead.²

King Vikrama soon showed himself to be a noble and mighty ruler. He reduced the whole earth under his sway, performed

¹ The modern Oujein, in Mālava (west-central India). In the Jainistic and dependent versions the city is called Avantī.

² According to some versions Vikrama did not at once succeed his brother, but won the throne by proving that he was the only person capable of subduing a *vetāla* or demon which had infested the royal house. This *vetāla* then became a kind of familiar for Vikrama, rendering him aid on many occasions.

many heroic deeds, and at the same time exhibited great devotion to his moral and religious duties. On one occasion he nearly lost his life through too great readiness to grant a petition. A treacherous *yogin* ascetic obtained from the king a promise to assist him in the performance of a secret magic rite. Vikrama was required to go by night to a graveyard and take down a corpse which he was to find hanging on a tree there. This he must carry, in perfect silence, to the place where the *yogin* was awaiting him. Now the corpse was inhabited by a *vetāla* ("vampire" or demon), which began to speak as the king took down the corpse. The *vetāla* told the king a story, at the end of which the king made some comment: thereupon the corpse disappeared from his shoulder and returned to the tree again. This was repeated 24 times: but the twenty-fifth time the king kept silent. The *vetāla* rewarded his steadfastness by warning him against the *yogin*, who was plotting to kill him. In this very summary form, and without relating the 25 stories told to Vikrama by the *vetāla*, our work presents the episode which is told in full by the well-known story-collection called the *Vetālapañcaviṅṣati* ("Twenty-five *Vetāla*-stories").

At this time Vikrama paid a visit to the court of Indra, king of the gods, upon Indra's invitation, to decide which of the two nymphs, Rambhā and Urvaṣī, was the better dancer. He gave the palm to Urvaṣī, and defended his decision so plausibly as to win the admiration of Indra, who gave him his own throne as a reward. This throne was a very marvellous one, of divine workmanship, and the seat was supported by 32 statuettes, female figures wrought with all kinds of precious stones. Vikrama took it back to earth and set it up with due ceremony in his capital of Ujjayinī.

Towards the end of the reign of Vikrama there was born in the city of Pratiṣṭhāna a boy named Ṣālivāhana. His birth is said to have been miraculous, and various omens informed Vikrama that through this Ṣālivāhana he was destined to meet death. Vikrama gathered an army and marched against Pratiṣṭhāna, but by the miraculous aid of the serpent-god Ṣeṣa, who was reputed to be the father of Ṣālivāhana, the army was routed and Vikrama was killed by a blow from Ṣālivāhana's staff. After his death no one was found worthy to mount the divine throne, and the ministers buried it in the earth.

Many years after this King Bhoja reigned in the city of Dhārā, the successor of the old Ujjayinī or Avanti. The field where the throne was buried had come into the possession of a certain Brahmin, who had built a platform upon the mound in the center, for the purpose of scaring away birds from his field. Now it appeared that whenever this Brahmin mounted on the platform, he seemed to be inspired with the greatest generosity and benevolence, although at other times he was conspicuously mean and selfish. When King Bhoja's attention was drawn to this circumstance he bought the field which seemed to have such unusual qualities, and caused the mound to be opened: whereupon the wonderful throne was brought to light. The king was delighted, and gave orders to move it to the city: but it could not be moved until, on the advice of a minister, Bhoja performed sacrifices to the gods on the spot. This gives occasion for a long digression, in which the minister illustrates the value to a king of a wise counsellor by a story which is otherwise met with very frequently in India: it is perhaps most familiar from the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, where it appears as the story of the wise minister Bahuçruta, who saved the Brahmin Vararuci from the unjust jealousy of his master King Nanda.

After this King Bhoja moved the throne to his city and set it up with great pomp in a hall of a thousand columns: and in an auspicious moment he started to mount it. But as soon as he placed his foot upon the head of one of the statuettes, preparatory to ascending the throne, the statue spoke to him with a human voice and said:

King Bhoja, unless thou canst show the like of the nobility, heroism, generosity and other virtues possessed by Vikrama, thou shalt not mount upon this throne.

The king answered:¹ O statue, I can show all the generosity and other virtues of which thou speakest: which one is lacking? Surely I grant so far as I may all things that are asked of me.

(The statue replied): O king, this is not seemly, that with thine own lips thou dost boast of thine own gifts. He who praises his own virtues is verily a base man; but an upright man speaketh not thus. And it is said:

Only a low man speaks of his own virtues and other men's faults: for of his own virtues and other men's faults a righteous

¹ From this point literal translation of the southern version.

man verily will not speak. . . . Hearing the words of the statue King Bhoja was astonished and said: Thou hast spoken truly: he who praises his own virtues is no better than a fool. I made mention of my own virtues: that was indeed wrong. Do thou therefore tell of the nobility of him whose this throne was.

And the statue said:¹ O king, give ear!

(Here follows the first story).

Each story is introduced in like manner by an attempt to mount the throne on the part of Bhoja: each time another statue stops him with the same challenge, and in response to his humble inquiry (he does not again attempt to praise himself) the statue tells a story intended to illustrate the nobility of Vikrama. At the end of each tale the statue again addresses the king: If thou canst show *such* nobility, etc., then mount upon this throne! To which Bhoja does not venture a reply.

At the end of the 32d story all the statues step down from their places, and saluting King Bhoja explain their origin. They were servants of Parvatī and incurred the goddess's jealous displeasure by casting coquettish glances at her consort Ćiva (or as one version has it, it was Ćiva who tried to make advances to them). For this reason they were cursed to become lifeless statues on the throne of Indra, until such time as this throne should have passed through the hands of Vikrama and been discovered by Bhoja. They should then tell to Bhoja the deeds of Vikrama, and thus obtain release. The statues then mount into heaven, having blessed King Bhoja and whosoever else should hear, read or repeat the tales of the Vikramacarita. And king Bhoja reigned long and prosperously.

The Jaina recensions and those that depend on them have a different explanation of the curse of the statues, which seems to me obviously secondary, by reason of its strong religious tinge: the rather unethical original account was made over by the Jainist writers into a tale having a more religious (though to be sure not at all exclusively Jainistic) point. According to this they had been servants of Indra, and were cursed for laughing irreverently at an extremely dirty and ill-kempt ascetic whom they chanced to see one day.

The introduction and frame story occupy a large part—roughly speaking, one-fifth—of the entire work. From an artistic stand-

¹ To this point literal translation of the southern version.

point, or at least from our artistic standpoint, this is also the best part. The stories themselves, considered simply as stories, are, I must say, rather monotonous. I presume this is the reason why Europeans have not yet devoted to the work anything like as much attention as its importance in Indian literature would seem to warrant. The best stories in the book are to a large extent found in the introduction.

This brings us to another question. From what point of view are we to look at such a work as the *Vikramacarita*? What ideas were uppermost in the mind of its composer? What effects did he desire to produce in the minds of his hearers, and by what means did he strive to produce them?

To the average Westerner such questions may sound unnecessary. Folklore, to our minds, generally means simply folklore: stories are stories: their prime purpose, we assume, is to give esthetic pleasure to the audience. We recognize, to be sure, the possibility, and even perhaps now and then the desirability, of mixing in a little sermonizing, but we demand at least that the pill be carefully sugar-coated with an irreproachable literary form. We tolerate, perhaps even admire, Tolstoi, because notwithstanding his theory of the immorality of art he remained to the end, in spite of himself, an artist. But we do not recognize Bellamy's *Looking Backward* as literature.

The Hindu theory—I am speaking now *only* of theory—was wholly different, at least as far as concerns the fable and story¹ literature.

The Hindus have a familiar formula which classifies all human desires and aspirations as directed towards three things: *dharma* or religion, *artha* or worldly advancement, and *kāma* or love. With obvious dependence on this classification, the Jain scholar Haribhadra says in a treatise on the subject (*Samarāicchakahā*, ed. Jacobi, p. 2), that stories are of four kinds, according as they are intended to serve and promote the fulfillment of any one of these three ends, or, fourthly, of more than one of them at the same time. After making due allowance for the Hindu passion

¹ Although the *Vikramacarita*, in its Sanskrit form, contains hardly a trace of beast-fable, it is impossible to make a sharp division between fable and fairy-story in India. Generally speaking the two are inextricably mingled, and the same tendencies and principles, both esthetic and moral, are found in both. Most Hindu collections also include both.

for schematization, it must after all be regarded as significant that Haribhadra does not mention at all the purpose which we should naturally think of as the main object of stories—the entertainment of the audience. He only recognizes practical ends as admissible, or indeed conceivable; for he is dealing descriptively with facts, and is not voicing a theory of his own as to how things *should* be done.

In a general way the ethical and practical character of Hindu stories has always been more or less recognized. The Hindu story collections are called in Sanskrit by the term *nītiśāstra*, which I should translate “textbook of conduct”. Hertel¹ gives a somewhat narrower interpretation in this connection of the word *nīti*, which I render “conduct”. He thinks it is a synonym of *artha*, “worldly advancement”, or to quote his own words, “Nutzen, Erwerb”: after setting up this equation he goes on to further describe *nīti* as “Führung, Betragen, kluge Lebensführung, daher auch List, Klugheit”. I agree in general with Hertel’s understanding of *nīti* (though on the doubtful point as to whether it may mean “List”, trickery, I do not feel like expressing an opinion). But I am not ready to agree that a *nīti*-textbook is necessarily an unmoral Machiavelli, simply a compendium of shrewd and worldly wisdom for the practical conduct of affairs, whether public or private. This may be what the Pañcatantra is: but it does not at all describe the Vikramacarita, which is also certainly a *nītiśāstra*.² In this book at least *artha* is distinctly subordinated to *dharma*, moral and religious conduct, which so completely occupies the center of the stage that the *artha* or Machiavellian side of *nīti* is at times an almost negligible quantity.

The Vikramacarita is, then, a textbook of conduct, intended to show by precept and example how to live. The example is furnished by the hero of the story, King Vikrama himself. He is held up to the world as a pattern of right living,—particularly, of course, right living for kings, since he was himself a great emperor, and some of his most marked virtues, such as his unbounded generosity and his habit of never refusing anything

¹ See his Tantrākhyāyika, Einleitung, pp. 6ff. This illuminating and admirable treatise contains the latest and best resumé of the general concepts of Hindu story literature.

² It is definitely so described in the introduction to at least one MS, and is certainly regarded as such in all.

to a suppliant,¹ are distinctly kingly virtues. So that we find after all that the Vikramacarita sets out to be more than anything else a Mirror for Magistrates, just like the Pañcatantra, except that the Pañcatantra is more worldly and political, while our work is moral,—both these things, however, being different phases of the comprehensive Hindu term *nīti*, conduct. At the same time the Vikramacarita, again like the Pañcatantra, by no means limits itself to the sphere of royal activities. There is hardly a phase of every-day life that is not touched on to some extent. One very interesting little tale² points out the evils of gambling. In another³ young men are admonished to devote themselves to study instead of frivolous or immoral pursuits. Sometimes a moral question is discussed from both sides, pro and con, the discussion taking the form of a debate between two characters in the story. For instance, in the 14th story, a wandering *yogin* meets the king in a distant kingdom and reproaches him for the impolitic act of leaving his kingdom in the hands of ministers, who might do—the Lord knows what with it. The king replies that all such things are in the hands of fate, against which there is no use in contending, and illustrates his point by an interjected story of a king who successively lost and won a kingdom by divine will alone, and without any effort on his own part.⁴ This is the only instance in our work, with the exception of one case in the introduction, of that boxing in of stories within stories which is so common in the Pañcatantra.

Whatever the stories may begin with, they almost always end with some astonishing act of generosity or self-sacrifice on the part of Vikrama. The monotonously regular type is as follows. The king hears of some person in need or distress, usually of a supernatural character—persecution by a demon, refusal of a deity to grant a boon, or the like. The god, demon, or other supernatural agent demands a human life as condition precedent to granting immunity or whatever favor is desired. Vikrama offers his own life, usually by starting to cut his own throat, in several instances by jumping into a caldron of boiling oil, occa-

¹ In the 6th story he gives an enormous gift to a lying ascetic on the strength of a story which the king knows to be false, simply to avoid the sin of refusing a suppliant.

² Story 27.

³ Story 9.

⁴ Another instance of such a moral debate is found in the twelfth story, which is translated below.

sionally by other means. The deity is appeased and either checks his attempt on his own life, or gives his life back to him after he has taken it. Usually some magic amulet or other article of value is given him in addition: this he always gives away to some beggar whom he meets on his way back to the city. Occasionally he shows more heroic qualities by fighting with and killing demons who are molesting some one, generally a woman. In a few cases his nobility is only exhibited by an enormous recompense for some trifling service. The Jainistic recensions are particularly monotonous in their recital of case after case of this kind of thing: they are so wholly absorbed in the moral side of the matter that they seem as if purposely to emphasize the nobility of Vikrama by reciting the various instances of it as nearly in the same terms as possible. The best known Brahministic recension, the Southern, is probably a truer representative of the original, and is superior to the Jainistic in this respect: it shows, in fact, considerable skill in giving variety in detail to a monotonous central theme. But even here it is always evident that the principal effort is not primarily to interest the reader, but to present in Vikrama the picture of an ideal prince, a model for real princes to shape themselves after. The prime virtue of Vikrama, the one most constantly harped upon, is his *āudārya*—a term which is perhaps more closely approached by “nobility” than by any other English term. It is the abstract noun to the adjective *udāra*, which means exalted, lofty, noble. It is thus a sufficiently vague term to be made to include about all virtues which ought properly to be found in a king, including many of the distinctly chivalrous virtues, notably protection of the weak and lavish generosity. Next in frequency of occurrence come *dhāirya*, manliness, *satva*, courage, and *paropakāra*, general benevolence, doing good to others, charity. Another virtue which is occasionally mentioned is *gāmbhīrya*, which means literally depth, and might be supposed to mean dignity, composure, constancy or the like: but as used in the *Vikramacarita* it seems to mean hardly anything else than generosity.

An exception to the ordinary run is the 24th story, which is a long and compound story containing at least two originally independent themes. The second of them is another account of Vikrama's contest with his rival *Çalivāhana*, already referred to in the introduction. In this case however the account is con-

siderably altered. Vikrama himself is not injured in the battle, but his army is struck lifeless by the power of the serpent-god *Çeşa*, the father of *Çālivāhana*. Vikrama thereupon by a long and severe penance propitiates *Çeşa* and obtains from him nectar (*amṛta*) with which to revive his army. *Çālivāhana* sends a Brahmin to meet him: the Brahmin asks Vikrama to give him the nectar, and Vikrama, although he knows that the man is a messenger from his enemy, gives it to him, rather than refuse a favor asked. This *Çālivāhana*¹ appears in many places in Hindu legendary history, and is persistently represented as the enemy of *Vikramāditya*, and as finally overcoming him. He also, like Vikrama, is said to have founded an era, to wit, the *Çaka* era, which begins with 78 A. D. In spite of the obvious impossibility of reconciling these two statements with the tradition above alluded to, that our Vikrama founded the Vikrama era of 57 B. C., there was long supposed to be historical ground for the tradition.

VERSIONS.

There are known to be in existence about seventy manuscripts of the *Vikramacarita*.²

Of these, seven are in Germany, one in Denmark, two in Austria, about a dozen in England, one³ is now in the writer's own possession, and the rest are in India. I collated the German and Danish manuscripts during the summer of 1911. Nearly all the others which belong in Europe have been lent to me,—the English ones through the great kindness of Dr. Thomas, librarian of the India Office, who has also helped to secure for me the loan of a number of the MSS. from India. To him my thanks are due in an unusual degree. I already have collated enough manuscripts to be in good control of the texts of the three most important versions (I, III, and IV below), besides having seen one MS. each of the other two. It is of course possible that still other versions may turn up among the manuscripts which I have not as yet seen. There is some doubt in my mind as to whether the so-called Vararuci version (V, see below), of which I know as yet only one manuscript, is sufficiently distinct from the Jain-

¹ Also called *Sālavāhana*, *Sāta*- etc., etc.; there are numerous variations of the name.

² Nearly all these can be found listed in Aufrecht's *Catalogus Catalogorum*.

³ Which originally formed part of the Hiersemann Collection of Indian MSS, offered for sale in Leipzig.

istic, on which it is evidently based, to warrant its classification as a distinct version. Certainly most of its text is practically the same as that of the *recensio jainica*. I have, however, for the present followed Weber in recognizing the division.

I. THE SOUTHERN PROSE RECENSION.¹

There is little doubt, it seems to me, that this comes closer to the original Vikramacarita than any other text as yet known to me. It seems to be fairly definitely connected with the south of India, where, in fact, only this and the following (metrical) recension seem to be known. Many of its MSS. are written on palm-leaves and in alphabets characteristic of South India (Telugu, Grantha, Nandināgarī). It is this fact that makes me hesitate to believe that this *is* the original, out and out. It is contrary to our usual experience to find such works originating in the south. On the other hand, there is some reason to suppose that there once existed a full Northern Brahmanical version, now lost, which was the basis of the abbreviated version (III). This seems to be based on a version not quite the same as our Southern version, though very much closer to it than to the Jainistic version.

The Southern version is certainly the best from an artistic point of view. It is composed in a free, flowing and generally simple style, mainly in prose, but extensively interlarded with sententious verses of the sort so common in Hindu story literature—proverbial saws intended both to point a moral and, incidentally, to adorn a tale. There are a few cases in which we find a verse thrown into the midst of the story, carrying on the narrative. This usually occurs at what Prof. Bloomfield has called in another connection "summit moments" of the story. Thus at the end of the Introduction, when the first of the statues addresses Bhoja, she does so in verse—which emphasizes the startling solemnity of the occasion.

A high degree of skill is often shown in the working out of the details of the narrative. It would be a mistake, however, to suppose that this less single devotion to the moral purpose indicates that this version is more secondary than the other versions. The same mistake was made by the scholars of former times who supposed that the Buddhistic Jātakas were more primitive than the Pāñcatantra, among other reasons because they were often stronger on the moral than on the artistic

¹ To this belongs the Jīvānanda edition.

side. We know now that Hindu story-books at their best are extremely high examples of the art of story-telling, even though at the same time their professed purpose remains just as truly a moral one. And in fact the Southern version is fully as good an example of a true *nitiçāstra* as the Jainistic: it would be possible to quote many cases in which it takes much greater pains to prove a moral point which the Jainistic version merely touches on in passing, or even omits altogether. It is, by the way, much longer than the Jainistic version (nearly twice as long).

II. THE SOUTHERN METRICAL VERSION.

Known to Weber through his MS. T. It is written entirely in verse. The version it is based on was evidently essentially the same as the Southern prose recension just alluded to. There are however many differences of detail, some serious abbreviations of the narrative, and at least one long interpolation, the story of the Weaver as Viṣṇu (see below). This version is so obviously secondary in every way that it is of little importance for our present purpose.

III. THE SHORT (NORTHERN) RECENSION.

Represented by Weber's C and O, and by S in its first part; also by our L (a Leipzig MS.) and by a MS. from Vienna. The version on which it is based is also essentially the same as the Southern version: but most of the book, and especially the 32 individual stories themselves (as distinguished from the introduction and frame-story), are very much shortened, so much so in fact, that only the barest skeleton of most of them is left, and they are often not even intelligible without reference to one of the fuller texts. It is indeed a very curious performance, this deliberate reducing of the book to a mere collection of bones, which fairly rattle with dryness. Weber was without doubt on the right track when he said of MS. C of this recension (p. 225 f.): "diese Abkürzung trifft speziell den je ersten Theil jeder Erzählung, der von den Abenteuern Vikrama's berichtet, während der jedesmalige Schluss, der von seiner Grossmuth . . . handelt, hier und da sogar ziemlich breit getreten wird". In other words, it is an extreme instance of utter devotion to the moral purpose, resulting in an almost ascetic mortifi-

cation of the story. The way the introduction is treated bears this out. For though, as I have said, it occupies proportionately much more space than the stories themselves, this space is only to a slight extent occupied with the telling of the events which happened. It is mostly composed of an enormous quantity of sententious and moral verses, taken from no one knows where (they mostly do not appear in the other versions), or perhaps to some extent original. (It is a curious fact, in contrast to this, that the 32 stories in this recension contain almost no verses.) Let it be particularly noted that this *reductio ad absurdum* of morality as the purpose of Hindu story-telling is patently the work, not of a Jaina or a Buddhist, but of an orthodox Hindu.

As a matter of fact, the MSS. of this recension themselves give evidence that the copyists were sometimes offended by the threadbareness of the work. In fact, they did not hesitate to try their hand at improving the text at times. Weber's MS. O seems to have been quite arbitrary in some of its changes, to judge by Weber's account of its contents (I have not been able to see it: its custodians, I am informed, are not willing to lend MSS). Our MS. L and the fragmentary Berlin MS. C (which only contains the last part, from Story 15 to the end) appear to be freest from such secondary influences: yet L contains passages seemingly written over from some MS. of the Jainistic recension, with considerable verbal modifications: and C is peculiar in that at the end of its text proper its writer, evidently being conscious of the fact that the story of the end was quite differently told by the Jainas, goes straight ahead and tells the conclusion over again in the exact language of the Jainistic recension. This MS. therefore has two complete conclusions, one that belonging to its own version, the other that of the Jainistic version. The course of events here is so superficially obvious that it is hard to understand how Weber could have been blind to what took place. Yet he (p. 188) tries to argue from the appearance of the verse naming Kṣemaṅkara as author, found at the end of the *second* (Jainistic) conclusion of C, that this verse was *not* peculiar to the Jainistic version, because C "nicht zur Jaina-Recension gehört"! The fact is, of course, that this section of C *is* Jainistic.

Weber makes the same mistake, and in the same connection, about the conclusion of his MS. S, speaking of it as non-Jainistic. The facts here are somewhat more complicated, but after all perfectly evident; one need hardly do more than study care-

fully Weber's own data about S, and observe the fact that all through Weber's critical apparatus for the Jainistic version, after the end of the first story, he quotes the variants from S as well as those from the pure Jainistic MSS.—which are as a rule hardly better representatives of their own text than S is, in this part of the book! It is obvious that S is a composite MS. The introduction goes according to the short recension, though with here and there (as in L, see above) an interpolation from a Jainistic MS. But after the end of the first story this cut-and-dried version was abandoned for the more literary Jainistic version,—although not entirely, for there are spots at which the writer inserts into the Jainistic text fragments from the version he started with. He also now and then modifies specifically Jainist passages to suit his own (Brahministic) prejudices. The fact that he was not a Jaina probably prevented him from throwing over altogether the threadbare Brahministic version with which he started. At any rate, from the end of the first story on to the end of the work, as well as in some places in the introduction, S is for practical purposes a Jainistic MS. Its readings are as close to the Jainist text, in these sections, as are those of several MSS. which Weber rightly classifies as Jainistic out-and-out. It is therefore wholly wrong to speak of the verse at its conclusion as coming from a non-Jainistic recension, as Weber does (*vide supra*).¹

IV. THE JAINISTIC RECENSION.

Of this some incidental information has been given while dealing with the other recensions. Thus we have seen that it is much shorter than the Southern. Its method of telling the stories is, in fact, largely determined by the concentration of the interest on the noble and self-sacrificing acts of Vikrama himself, somewhat to the neglect of other details in the story. The first part of each story, though not so neglected as in the Short Version, which almost leaves it out, is told seemingly as a necessary prelude, more or less, and is not enlarged upon in the free and natural way which characterizes the Southern text. The number of

¹ Still more to say (p. 221) that the 32 stories in their Jain. form (because borrowed verbally from a Jain. source into S) "form the ancient kernel of the original work"!

verses¹ in these parts is much smaller, and the whole style gives the impression of being somewhat cramped and consciously restricted.

Another peculiarity of this version is that nearly every one of the 32 stories is either begun or ended with an apparently original verse, or sometimes two, in which the chief points of the story from the narrator's point of view (especially the noble deeds of Vikrama) are briefly summed up. As Weber says, this is somewhat analogous to the *argumenta* often placed at the beginning of Latin comedies. As a rather imperfect Hindu analogon I would call attention to the verses with which the Pañcatantra fables are generally introduced, and which are then repeated at the end to emphasize the "moral". The parallel is imperfect, as I say: the Pañcatantra verses are skillful artistic devices for weaving each story into its setting. Of this there is nothing in the Vikramacarita: the stories all stand baldly by themselves, and are not, like the Pañcatantra fables, even *supposed* each to fit and illustrate a certain definite occasion or emergency. For this reason there is no occasion for the "*argumenta*": and in fact, I am not of the opinion that they belonged to the original. They only appear in the Jain. and dependent versions (Vararuci, MS. S), and have every appearance of being secondary. It seems not unlikely that they were meant to imitate the catch-verses of the Pañcatantra² fables, and were made up and inserted for that purpose by the redactor of the Jain. archetype.—The first half of our stories have the "*argumentum*" at the beginning, the last half at the end, and a few lack it altogether. There is no apparent reason for this variation.

I have already mentioned the fact that the Jain. conclusion is different from that of the other texts. The general run of the 32 stories is, however, the same. The differences are for the most part purely verbal (in this regard very marked, however, amounting to a complete rewriting of the story). The main themes are the same, and the incidents and motives, though now and

¹ The Jainistic version contains many verses in the Jaina Prakrit, although most of its verses, and all those which also appear in the other versions, are in the Sanskrit language. The Prakrit verses are probably for the most part quotations from sacred or semi-sacred Jaina texts. In some cases this is definitely stated. The narrative (prose) portion of the work is wholly in Sanskrit.

² I use the term Pañcatantra in a loose sense, as typifying the Hindu beast-fable literature. Similar verses are of course found in connection with fables wherever they are found in India, e. g. in the Jātakas.

then different, are seldom radically so. The 1st, 29th, 31st and 32d stories of the Jain. are, however, wholly different: the last three are quite new stories, and very poor ones at that,—almost certainly secondary additions,¹ and by no means improvements. The first story in the orthodox versions is really not a story, but merely a brief introductory eulogy of Vikrama. This evidently did not please the Jain redactor: he felt that there ought to be a story, and accordingly transferred to this place the story of the jealous king Nanda, his wise minister, and his Brahmin “*guru*”. The story is manifestly out of place here, and belongs where it is found in the Southern version, in the introduction, where it is told to King Bhoja by his minister to illustrate the value of a minister’s advice. In that position it has point: in the Jain. version, however, it is dragged in by the heels, apropos of nothing, and evidently only for the purpose of filling what the redactor felt as a gap in the first story.

It is the introduction to the Jain. version, however, which shows the most marked variation from the orthodox ones. In the first place, a large section is devoted to an entirely new insertion. In this Vikrama is represented as being converted to Jainism by the Jain. saint and teacher Siddhasena Divākara, who performs various miracles which first astonish and finally persuade the king. Siddhasena then lives at the court for a long time under the patronage of the king. There are other sources of Jainistic tradition which also bring Vikrama into relations with this Siddhasena,² and in such a way as to indicate a probable genetic relation between them and this section of the *Vikramacarita*. The Jainas and Buddhists were fond of thus adopting and “converting” the famous heroes of Brahministic history and legend:

¹ The reasons for the substitution of these for the original stories are not hard to discover, but it would take too long to go into them here.

² One, which I have discovered, may be mentioned as being among the less familiar sources; it is the *Prabhāvakacarita*, a book of lives of Jainistic saints, ed. H. M. Sharmā, Bombay 1909: p. 95. (Chapter 8, verses 61–66 and 75–77.) Two incidents of the Siddhasena chapter of the Vikr. are here told in very summary form, but of two *different* kings, one called *Vikramārka*, the other *Vikrama*! It is clear from the narrative that they are not supposed to be the same. At first sight it would seem that this must be a secondary confusion, due to the various names under which King Vikrama goes. I shall not discuss the matter now, but will content myself with mentioning the interesting fact that one verse from the Jain. Rec. of the Vikr. (Weber 30) appears also in the *Prabhāv.* (8:64), with only one single variant (*udbhṛta-* for *ucchṛita-*).

Rāma, the hero of the Rāmāyaṇa, was treated in like manner by the Buddhists, see Jacobi, *Das Rāmāyaṇa*, p. 86. I would not attempt to read any deeper meaning into the circumstance.

There are other parts of the Introduction in which the Jain. Rec. differs from the others. For instance, the scene in Indra's heaven, in which Vikrama decides the dancing contest between Rambhā and Urvaṇī, is omitted altogether, evidently because dancing was disapproved of by the Jainas (as by the Buddhists). This removes the original motivation of the presentation of the throne to Vikrama by Indra (as a reward for his wisdom as shown in that decision). The Jain. Rec. is compelled to patch this up in what seems to the reader a very lame manner: Indra, it is said, observed the virtues and noble acts of Vikrama, and presented him with his throne in token of his admiration. Evidently the orthodox version is here the original.

The most striking difference of all, however, is the following. The *order of events* in the Introduction is wholly changed. Instead of beginning in chronological order with Bhartṛhari, Vikrama, and then Bhoja, we find ourselves at the very outset in Dhārā, the capital of Bhoja. The king discovers the magic throne, essentially in the same way as in the other versions, and the story of what had gone before (Bhartṛhari and Anaṅgasenā, the reign of Vikrama, etc.) is put into the mouth of the first statue, who tells it to King Bhoja when he first attempts to mount the throne! This gives the first statue an entirely disproportionate amount of talking: for she also has a long story to tell (the Nanda story, referred to above), which is clearly recognized, moreover, as *her* "number", her share of the 32 stories: the introduction does not take the place thereof. The change is not successful as an artistic device, although I am inclined to think it was introduced for artistic reasons.

Namely: it was a habit with the Hindus to produce a certain external unity in their works of fiction by putting them into a sort of dramatically unified form. The Mahābhārata, the Pañcatantra, the Kathāsaritsāgara, and so on—all the great works in this department of literature are supposed to have been *told* by somebody to somebody else. The Vikramacarita itself, in all the orthodox versions, is told by Īva to his consort. In the Jain. version this of course had to be dropped. That left the work without any such uniform "binding-together". But the major part of the work was already unified by another bond of the same

sort: the 32 stories themselves, comprising perhaps four-fifths of the book, were all told to Bhoja—if not by the same person, at least by the same group of individuals. It seems to me not unlikely that it was the desire to throw the matter contained in the introduction into this same binding that prompted the change above alluded to. As a result of it, practically the whole book, after the opening scene, is told to Bhoja by one or another of the 32 statues. At least, I throw out this suggestion for what it is worth. If it cannot stand on its own inherent probability, I admit I have no further support for it. But I am unable to conceive any other reason for the change: and the matter is not helped, moreover, by assuming with Weber that the Jain. Rec. is the original, and the orthodox order secondary. There is still no apparent reason for such a change being made.¹

Not all the MSS. classed as Jainistic are simply reproductions of the standard Jain. text. Thus Weber's MS. H is an abbreviated text, like the Short Brahministic Recension, only based on the Jain. Rec. Its abbreviation is, however, not so drastic as that of the other. In fact the narrative portions of the text are on the whole quite well preserved: it is the verses which suffer the most.—The case is different with MS. K. This is clearly a Brahminized version of the Jain. text. Although speaking generally it follows its original literally, with only verbal variants and no more of them than most of the Jain. MSS. show, it deliberately changes all specifically Jainistic references, making them Brahministic: or sometimes, as in the Siddhasena chapter of the introduction, it omits whole passages which are characteristically Jainistic and do not lend themselves well to this sort of proselyting. The good Brahmin who did the job was more pious than clever: the changes made are at times very labored, and often the original shows through clearly.—The same thing, more or less, was attempted by the author of the Vararuci re-

¹Weber rightly discards his own tentative suggestion that the Jainistic order, beginning with Bhoja, may be a form of flattery of Bhoja himself (the version where it appears being assumed to be the work of a writer at his court). In the first place, the Rec. Jain. refers to Bhoja as belonging to the past (and is the only version which does so). In the second place, the orthodox versions contain more fulsome flattery of Bhoja than does the Jainistic.—In passing it may be noted that a number of the secondary (non-Sanskrit) versions have the same transposition of the introduction. To discuss the meaning of this would involve us in the whole complicated problem of the interrelation of the versions, which I must postpone for the present.

cension, and by the writer of S in those parts which he took from the Jain. text. They, however, do not otherwise keep so closely to the Jain. original as does K.

V. THE VARARUCI OR BENGAL VERSION.

This is evidently an adaptation either of the Jainistic version as we now have it, or of its archetype. It agrees almost verbally with it in most parts, and shows clear traces of its original Jainistic character. The good Brahministic redactor modified or omitted most of the specifically Jainistic passages, trying to adapt them to Brahministic prejudices. His art, however, was not the equal of his religious zeal, and he left many evidences of the original. This seems to me to show the improbability of Weber's and Hertel's assumption that all the other versions were based on Jainistic sources. To change a Jainistic into an orthodox work so completely as to leave no traces of its origin was not so easy a task as these scholars seem to have supposed, and certainly it required much more care and precision than the average Hindu redactor possessed. If the orthodox recensions had originated in this way, they would be almost sure to show it in superficially obvious ways, as does the Var. version, and as does even the remote French translation of the Bengali rendering (see below). Some name of a Jainistic saint or the like would have stuck in the text, somewhere.—This recension might also be called the Eastern or Bengal recension, since it was evidently connected with that part of India. Several of its MSS are written in the Bengali alphabet, and it was obviously from this Sanskrit version that the Bengali version was translated, to judge from Féer's French rendering of the Bengali, which in many parts might pass for a translation of the Sanskrit text of the Var. version. (The changes are mainly artistic embellishments: there is one new story added.) In one or two cases it still retains in the text the names of Jainistic saints, although the context shows that neither the pious Bengali Hindu nor his French translator had any idea who these personages really were. Féer, who professes himself quite ignorant of the Skt. *Vikramacarita*, gives us no information about the origin of the book he translated except that it was worked over from the Skt., and that its "author" (i. e. the Bengali redactor) was named Mrtyumjaya.

RELATIONSHIP OF THE VERSIONS TO EACH OTHER.

I have already had occasion to say that it seems to me that the Brahministic versions are more closely related to the original text than the Jainistic version and texts dependent on it. Owing to the large amount of space required, and to the highly technical character of the evidence, it has not seemed feasible to do more in this preliminary paper than to hint at the reasons which I think I have found for this belief. They will be presented in full at some future time. Inasmuch, however, as both Weber and Hertel, two eminent scholars, and the only two who have publicly expressed opinions on the subject so far as I know, have taken the opposite view, it seems to be my duty to consider now the reasons they have advanced and show why, in my opinion, there is at least no sound reason for holding, with them, that the original *Vikramacarita* was written by a Jaina. This is, I fully realize, quite a different matter from proving that the contrary is true: and all I can at present ask of scholars is that they will consider the question undecided until such time as I shall be able to publish my reasons for holding the position I take.

As for Weber, the main reason he has for giving priority to the Jainistic recension is expressed by him I. St. XV: 186, where he says: "The devout ethical character which pervades the work seems to me to point directly to a Buddhistic, or rather to a Jainistic, origin". This sentence implies two propositions which were current in Weber's time, but which are now usually admitted to be radical errors, to wit:

a) that the Jains were a Buddhist sect. It is now commonplace knowledge that they were a quite independent body, though founded about the same time (probably somewhat earlier), and holding similar doctrines in many ways (these doctrines, however, can mostly be paralleled nearly as well from Brahministic as from Buddhistic sources).

b) that there was a sharp division between the Jains and Buddhists as writers on the one hand and the orthodox Hindus on the other, the former being characterized by a much greater preoccupation with moral questions: and that the Hindu story literature, because of the preponderance of such questions in it, was largely if not wholly Buddhistic or Jainistic in origin.

On this the venerable French scholar Barth said in 1889 (*Mélusine*, IV, 558): "People have thus become accustomed more and more to admit as an axiom that all this literature (*viz.* Hindu

stories and fables) is of Buddhistic origin. *In my opinion it would hardly be a more serious error to maintain the opposite thesis of a śivaitic or tantric origin.*¹ The past of India does not offer such clearcut divisions. To introduce them here is to judge of this past with our occidental habits of mind, and it is furthermore markedly to exaggerate the rôle and the originality of communities (i. e. the Buddhists and Jainas) which after all were only Hindu sects".

This expresses so concisely and admirably the position which I believe is now generally held by scholars, in theory at least, that to add to it would be to detract from it—*sit venia verbis*. If the truth of it be granted, the bottom drops out of Weber's argument at once. In other words, the ethical character of the *Vikramacarita* is no more characteristic of Jainistic than of orthodox story literature.

Weber was also misled by his failure to see the true nature of some of his manuscripts, notably S (see above, p. 264 f.). Assuming this to be a fair representative of a non-Jainistic version, and finding traces of Jainism in it, he argued that the original work must have been Jainistic. Since the greater part of the composite manuscript S was copied from a Jainistic archetype (a fact which seems to me superficially obvious, and which I shall have occasion to show at a later time), no such argument is allowable. The real Brahministic recensions (Nos. I–III) show no such traces of Jainism, in my opinion. I shall now try to show that Hertel² was wrong in holding a contrary opinion.

¹ Italics mine.

²In his article "Ueber die Jaina-Recensionen des Pañcatantra", in *Ber. u. Verh. d. kgl. sächs. Ges. d. Wiss., ph-hist. Kl.*, 54: 23ff., especially 115ff.—It is only fair to call attention to the fact that Hertel's remarks on this subject were not only made some time ago, but did not constitute, perhaps, an important part of the subject he had under consideration, and were moreover based principally on second-hand knowledge gained from Weber, as a result of which he was sometimes seriously misled as to facts. It is with regret that I find it necessary to differ so radically with a scholar whose work on the *Pañcatantra* has given me so much valuable information and inspiration. Let me in this connection say that to a large extent the work which I am attempting to do on the *Vikramacarita* was suggested by the very fruitful results which Hertel produced out of his intensive and comparative study of the *Pañcatantra*. I am also in receipt of a very kind personal letter from Professor Hertel, and of some other materials which he was good enough to send me, which contain valuable suggestions as to methods of work in this field, and for which I take this opportunity to publicly thank him.

Hertel's occasion for bringing in the *Vikramacarita* is this: he desires to show that the *Pañcatantra* story of the Weaver as *Viṣṇu*¹ was inserted in the two recensions of that work wherein it appears by a Jaina, as a satire on the god *Viṣṇu*. This would jump with his theory that these two recensions were of Jainistic origin. Hertel found from Weber that a metrical version of this fable was inserted in the single MS. known to him of the Metrical version of the *Vikramacarita* (II, see above, p. 263). Now unfortunately for Hertel's theory, this MS. belongs, as Weber shows, to an indubitably Brahministic recension. In all the other MSS, including all those of the Jainistic recension, this supposedly Jainistic "satire on *Viṣṇu*" is not found: it remained for the compiler of a Brahministic version to insert it; or else, on the perhaps still more improbable assumption which Hertel seems inclined to make that this single, metrical, obviously late and secondary recension preserves an episode of the original that has disappeared from every other version—on this assumption, I say, we must suppose that the only recension to preserve this attack on *Viṣṇu* was a Brahministic version, while the anti-Brahministic *recensio jainica* expunged it. There is no third alternative, if Hertel is right in thinking that the story of the Weaver as *Viṣṇu* is Jainistic. And it would be hard to say which is the less likely.

As I have said, Hertel seems to prefer to impale himself on the second horn of this dilemma, viz. the assumption that the metrical MS. T preserves the story from the original. He thinks he finds support for this in the fact that nearly all manuscripts of all recensions have, in fact, at this spot in the story the opening verse, which is at the same time the catch-word for the whole fable. This verse says in effect that the gods come to the aid of a man who proceeds confidently and with firm resolve, as *Viṣṇu* helped the Weaver. It seems to me clear that it was brought in simply as a proverbial allusion to a well-known story, illustrating the moral which the speaker wished at the moment to enforce, viz.: "God helps those who help themselves". The verse fits perfectly the place where it is inserted, and doubtless belonged

¹ A famous jocular story in which an impostor of low birth (a weaver) rigs himself up as *Viṣṇu*, and works the trick so well that he marries the king's daughter: attacked by a powerful force of enemies, he impudently takes the field alone in his garb of *Viṣṇu*, and the real *Viṣṇu* comes to his defense, in order to save his own credit before the people, who believed in the weaver as the true *Viṣṇu*.

to the original *Vikramacarita*, since it occurs in most versions. Assuming the evident fact that the Weaver as Viṣṇu was a popular and well-known story, nothing could be more natural than an allusion to it in such a connection. The writer of the late poetic recension then took advantage of the allusion to the story which he already found there, and gave an exhibition of his art and his learning by writing out the whole thing in full—a process which occurs repeatedly in the history of Sanskrit story redactions, as no one has shown more clearly than Prof. Hertel. But the simple explanation does not appeal to him in this case. Instead he tries to prove the Jainistic character of the original *Vikramacarita*, from which he supposes that T has preserved the story in full. He does so partly (1) on the ground of false ideas of the contents of the Tübingen MS. V, which he had never seen, and Weber's statements about which he misunderstood: and partly (2) on the ground of what seem to me distorted notions of the attitude one should expect to find displayed towards the orthodox Hindu gods, and of the distinctions that it is safe to make between Jains and orthodox Hindus. (Cf. Barth, l. c.)

1) In the nineteenth story Vikrama pays a visit to Bali, a sort of Hindu Hades, reigning in Pātāla (the under-world). The two kings exchange graceful compliments, and Vikrama is entertained by Bali. Among other courteous speeches, Vikrama says to Bali that it is an especial honor to see one to whom Nārāyaṇa (the god Viṣṇu) once came "with a request" (*arthihvena*). This is the only reference to Viṣṇu in this story in the Southern version, and surely there is no insult to the god contained in it. It is a very delicate allusion on the part of Vikrama to a well-known episode in which Bali, who was at one time a demon and an enemy of the gods, was outwitted by Viṣṇu. Bali was once king over the universe: but Viṣṇu appeared before him in the guise of a dwarf and asked of him as much land as he could cover in three strides. The wish being granted, the god assumed his true form and deprived Bali of heaven and earth in two strides, vouchsafing to leave him the under-world. Since Bali is his host, Vikrama on this occasion politely ignores everything except the fact that Bali once received the honor of a visit from the great god Viṣṇu, who asked a favor of him. The myth of Bali and Viṣṇu, by the way, is one whose orthodox character is unquestioned and unquestionable.

In the short recension (III) no allusion to Viṣṇu of any sort is

found. But in the Jainistic version (IV) we find a new addition. Here Viṣṇu is found acting as doorkeeper (*dvārapālaka*) in the palace of Bali! So far as I have been able to discover there is no authority for such a statement anywhere else, among all the numerous allusions to Viṣṇu and Bali in Hindu literature. Apparently it was invented by the author of the Jainistic version—perhaps, as Hertel thinks, as an insult to Viṣṇu, though even here, be it noted, he is called “*çrī Kṛṣṇa*” and spoken of not without respect. At any rate there is every reason to suppose that the Southern version, whose allusion to the myth is consistent with the other accounts of it known to us, was original, and that the Jainistic touch which makes Viṣṇu Bali’s door-keeper is a somewhat bizarre Jainistic addition.¹

2) In a more general way I am compelled to take issue with Prof. Hertel’s methods—with the means by which he undertakes to distinguish between that which is Jainistic and that which is Brahministic. It seems to me that he draws much too sharp and clear-cut distinctions between the two spheres. So in the matter of terminology: there are certain terms, epithets and phrases which are used very commonly by the Jainas. But that does not mean that wherever they occur, in any text, they must refer to things Jainistic. Hertel says (p. 86) that the word *digambara* and certain other words “*können*” nur auf Jaina bezogen werden”. Perhaps he means to say only when they are used all together: but on p. 89 n. 1 he follows Weber in making the word *digambara* (here without the support of any other similar words!) a proof

¹ Hertel bases his whole argument at this point on the mistaken assumption that the Tübingen MS, Weber’s V, a MS of the Southern recension, agrees with the Jainistic version in this. He is misled by a rather careless statement of Weber’s (p. 380 n. 1, seventh line), where for “in allen Textformen” read “in allen von der Rec. Jain. abhängigen Textformen”. “Alle” in Weber’s notes to his extracts from the Jainistic version always has this meaning, and never includes, unless specifically so stated, his manuscripts of other recensions, namely O, C, V and T. (The Vararuci MSS R and U, as well as K and S, are for the most part really Jainistic MSS.) The only allusion to Viṣṇu at this point in Weber’s V is that translated above, in which it agrees with all the MSS. of the Southern Rec. known to me. The text of the sentence (disregarding a few orthographic variants) is: *tavāiva janma ślāghyaṁ, sākṣād Vāikunṭhakaṇṭhīravo Nārāyaṇas tava mandiraṁ samāyāto ’rthitvena*. So, essentially, all my MSS: Jivānanda’s edition reads, I know not on what authority, *sadā virājati* for *samāyāto ’rthitvena*. As has been said, the MSS of the short recension (incl. Weber’s C) have no reference to Viṣṇu at all.

² Italics mine.

that the person designated was a Jaina monk of the *digambara* sect, and (since the person is depicted as a faithless traitor) concludes that the passage where it occurs is an attack upon that sect, though there is otherwise not a shred of evidence to support this view.—Now the word *digambara* is first an adjective meaning “naked”, and second a noun, meaning “a naked ascetic”. The standard dictionaries allow its use of any naked ascetic in India (and would Hertel maintain that all naked Indian ascetics are Jainas?), and according to Monier-Williams (*Brahminism and Hinduism*, p. 83) the word is used as an epithet of the god *Çiva*, in his aspect as naked ascetic. In other words, the word simply means *any* naked ascetic, and when there is otherwise no evidence that a text is speaking of Jainists, there is no reason for assuming that this word necessarily refers to a Jaina. The same is true, I believe, of most of the other words regarded by Hertel as necessarily Jainistic.

Equally unsound seems to me the tendency of Hertel to declare of heterodox origin every incident which treats the Hindu gods with less than what he considers a due amount of respect. For instance, as to the story of the Weaver as *Viṣṇu* above mentioned, Hertel uses the same sweeping language as in the passage just referred to: (p. 115 f.) “Es ist mir undenkbar, das der Anhänger irgend einer brahmanischen Sekte, sei es selbst ein *Çaiva* oder ein *Çakta*, diese Satire geschrieben haben sollte”. The “satire” consists in the fact that *Viṣṇu*, when informed of the weaver’s prank, is moved to come to the rogue’s rescue, lest he be killed, and the people therefore (thinking “*Viṣṇu* is dead”!) should offer no more sacrifices! But was this, to a Hindu mind of that day, such a serious insult to *Viṣṇu*? Is it not rather an example of the way popular deities are usually treated by their worshippers, especially among semi-primitive peoples? It seems to me a basic mistake to philosophize the matter as Hertel does. The writer of the story did not stop to ask himself whether or not the action of *Viṣṇu* was consistent with the god’s character and dignity. The purpose of the story, the whole point of the narrative (“God helps those who help themselves”), required that *Viṣṇu* should save the bold, though tricky, weaver. That is all there is to it. Even in our own day are not jocose stories told in which Christian saints appear in humorously undignified positions? And are not the tellers of these stories generally perfectly pious Christians? I am sure it would not be hard to find, at least in some of the more outlying

Christian countries of Europe, anecdotes in which the persons of the Trinity would be treated equally freely—and with no real disrespect intended. Even in serious texts it would not be hard to find in India stories where the gods are treated, by writers of unquestionable orthodoxy, in ways that would seem to us blasphemous. From the earliest Vedic times onward this is characteristic of many Indra legends (e. g. his affair with Namuci). In the Mahābhārata too the persons of the Hindu trinity come off with scant dignity on numerous occasions (though to be sure it is fashionable to explain the most glaring cases as due to “sectarian differences”).

In short, the fact that a Hindu god appears in what seems to us an unfavorable light in a given text does not furnish much, if any, reason for affirming that the text was written by a disbeliever in that god.

Moreover all this does not really concern the Vikramacarita. For there is no reason to suppose that the original Vikramacarita contained any situation which even by Hertel's criteria could be regarded as insulting to the orthodox Hindu gods. Of the two cases he cites one is limited to the Jainistic versions, and the other to the late and clearly secondary metrical version.

As a concrete illustration of the way the versions differ we append translations of a typical story, the twelfth, in the three principal recensions. The variations in plot are obvious and interesting, but this is not the time to discuss them. The verses of the original are printed with an indentation and numbered in the translation. Only two of the verses of the Southern, Nos. 2 and 3, appear also in the Jainistic,¹ as Nos. 5 and 6. The Short Recension has no verses in this story. The first two Jainistic verses comprise the “argumentum” or summary of the story (see above), and are therefore essentially unlike the other verses.

Words enclosed in parentheses, but printed in ordinary type, are necessary parts of the English translation, which are however not expressed in the Sanskrit, but understood from the context. *Italicized* words without parentheses are simply foreign (non-English) words:² but *in* parentheses they indicate either 1) alternative translations, intended to make the meaning clearer, or 2) explanatory notes added for the same purpose.

¹ With a few verbal variants of little importance.

² Barring a few cases where English words are italicized for emphasis, generally translating a Sanskrit particle of emphasis, *eva* or *api*.

TWELFTH STORY.

A. *Southern Recension.*

When the king again approached the throne to mount upon it, another statue said: O king, this is Vikrama's throne. Whoever is possessed of the nobility and other virtues of Vikrama, let him mount upon this throne.

And Bhoja said: Tell me a tale of his nobility and other virtues.

And the statue said: Hearken, O King!

In the reign of Vikramārka there was in his city a merchant named Bhadrāsena, who had a son Purandara. And there was no end to the wealth of this Bhadrāsena: yet was he not a squanderer. Now in the course of time Bhadrāsena died, and his son Purandara inherited all his father's property, and began to waste it extravagantly.

B. *Short Recension.*¹

Hearken, O king!

In the city of Vikramārka there was a certain merchant who had unlimited wealth. And he in time came to the end of his life. Then his son threw away his wealth in evil courses.

C. *Jainistic Recension.*

Again on another occasion when King Bhoja had performed all the coronation rites and was mounting the throne, the twelfth statue said: O king, (only) he mounts (*may mount*) upon this throne who has nobility like (that of) Vikramāditya.

And when the king asked: Of what sort was that nobility? the statue said: O king, hearken!

(*"Argumentum"*, here in two verses:)

(1) Having obtained great wealth by trade, and being rich as the Lord of Wealth (*the god Kubera*), a certain merchant died. His evil-minded son paid no heed to the timely warnings of his father's people and his other friends, who said: 'Look now, do not destroy this fortune by wicked wastefulness'. Bearing the stamp of his poverty (thus) brought about, he wandered forth into another country and came to a certain grove, rich in fair fruits.

(2) There he heard a woman crying by night.—Having heard all this from his lips, the noble Vikramārka went forth by night, taking his sword with sharp-gleaming-blade, and slew in conflict a demon that was tormenting the woman. The woman, freed from torment caused by her husband, gave him nine jars of gold, but he gave them to the merchant's son.

In the city of Avantī, the noble king Vikrama.

(There was) a merchant Bhadrāsena, whose son (was) Purandara. After his father's death he became (truly) a '*purandara*' ('*lavish dispenser*') of his father's wealth, enjoying himself in riotous living.

¹ *Eleventh* in this version, owing to a shift in the numbering. The Leipzig manuscript, owing to the accidental omission of an earlier tale, makes it the *tenth*.

(Southern Recension.)

Once upon a time his close friend Dhanada said to him: Purandara, although thou art of a mercantile family, thou dost waste thy money like a scion of nobility. This is not a mark of one sprung from a merchant's house. A merchant's son even though quite alone (*without a family*), should amass wealth, and should not waste so much as a cowry (*a very small coin*). The goods a man acquires will some day be of service to him, when some calamity occurs. So a prudent man should save up wealth against the coming of calamity. And it is said:

(1) A man shall defend his possessions for the event of misfortune, but shall defend his wife (if necessary) even with his possessions: himself however he shall always defend, even with (*at the sacrifice of*) both his wife and his possessions.

Hearing these words Purandara said: Dhanada, he who says that 'goods acquired will sometime be beneficial, when calamity occurs' is lacking in good judgment. When calamities come, then the riches that have been laid up are lost also. Therefore the wise man is not grieved for the past nor distressed about the future, but he should rather attend only to the present. And thus it is said:

(Short Recension.)

And he obeyed not the voice of his friends who warned him.

(Jainistic Recension.)

And his relations would have restrained him, saying: Look now, do not waste wickedly: wealth, if preserved, will be (surely) of some use or other. Wealth is the source of man's greatness,—since:

(3) This mass of waters (*the ocean, from which sprang Lakṣmī, goddess of Wealth and wife of Viṣṇu*) in producing your ladyship, O Lakṣmī! became a mine of jewels: the slayer of (the demon) Mura (*i. e. Viṣṇu*) by becoming thy husband became the lord of the three worlds: Kandarpa (*god of love*) through being thy son (*nandana*) became also the rejoicer (*nandana: a pun*) of the hearts of men: everywhere, I ween, high position has (*is due to*) the favor of thy grace.

By (the power of) wealth even faults become virtues: for:

(4) Sluggishness is changed into conservatism; restlessness takes the appearance of vigorous activity; taciturnity appears as reserve; stupidity becomes simple honesty; inability to distinguish (in giving alms) between the good and the worthless is changed into high-spirited generosity. O mother Lakṣmī! By the power of thy favor even vices shall become virtues!

When he heard these words of his relations he said:

(Southern Recension.)

(2) One should not grieve for the past, nor be distressed about the future: the wise occupy themselves with the things of the present.

What is to be, that will be, without any (outside) exertion: and what is (destined) to pass away, even thus will it pass away. And it is said:

(3) That which is destined to be—*is*, (maturing) like the milk of a cocoanut. That which is destined to pass away—it is already gone, they say, as a *kapittha*-fruit eaten by an elephant.

(4) For what is not to be surely is not, and what is to be, is, without any effort: and that which is not destined to belong to a man is lost to him, though he hold it in the palm of his hand.

To these words of Purandara Dhanada, having no reply, remained silent.

Then Purandara proceeded to waste all his father's goods. And then, when Purandara had no more money, his friends and relatives esteemed him no more, and would not even associate with him. And Purandara reflected in his heart: As long as there was money in my hands, so long these friends of mine were attentive unto me. But now they have no dealings with me. This is a true (observation on human) behavior: he who has money, he also has friends and the like. And it is said:

(5) He who has money has friends: he who has money has relatives: he who has money is a (great) man in the world: he who has money is also a scholar!

(Short Recension.)

Thus when his wealth had been dissipated, being poor—

(Jainistic Recension.)

(5) One should not grieve for the past, nor be distressed about the future: the wise occupy themselves with the present time.

(6) That which is destined to be—*is*, (maturing) like the milk of a cocoanut. That which is destined to pass away—it is already gone, they say, as a *kapittha*-fruit eaten by an elephant.

Then he spent and consumed all the wealth that his father had acquired. And when in the course of time he became poor, he was despised by his relations. For:

(7) Better is a forest infested by tigers and elephants, a shelter of trees, a diet of leaves, fruits and water, a bed of grass—better worn-out bark (garments), than life among relations for a man who has lost his wealth.

(Southern Recension.)

Furthermore:

(6) When a man is bereft of his money his relations do not crowd around him as before: being attached to his station alone, his parasites quickly go their own ways, his friends scatter, and—why make of it a long story? Even a man's wife is certain to have not so much regard for him when he has lost his wealth.

(7) Whatsoever man has wealth, that man is noble, learned, pious and virtuous: he verily is eloquent also, and handsome: all virtues rest upon gold.

Moreover:

(8) A thousand relations will attend a rich man, as long as he stands upon his feet, unscathed: but when he has lost his wealth no relative will so much as show his face.

And so:

(9) The wind is a friend of the fire that devours the forest, but he destroys the fire of a lamp: who has friendship for a poor man?

Therefore death is better than poverty. And it is said:

(10) 'Arise, my friend, and carry for just a moment the burden of my poverty, that poor weary I may at last enjoy the happiness that death has brought thee!' Hearing this cry of a poverty-stricken wretch, the corpse in the graveyard held its peace, knowing that death is much better than poverty.

And so:

(11) Hail to thee, Poverty! By thy grace I am become a magician! For though I can see everybody, no man can see me at all!

And likewise:

(12) Dead is a poor man: dead is conjugal intercourse that leads not to children: dead is a funeral-rite performed without a scripture-learned priest: dead is a sacrifice without a sacrificial fee.

Thus reflecting he went away into a far country.

(Short Recension.)

He went into a far country.

(Jainistic Recension.)

Thus reflecting he went into a far country.

(Southern Recension.)

And as he wandered he came to a certain city located near the Himālaya. And not far from this city there was a grove of bamboo. And he himself came to the outskirts of the town, and slept at night in the porch of some one's house. And at midnight he heard the shrieks of some woman crying in the bamboo grove: 'Good people, save me, save me, some *Rākṣasa* (*demon*) here is killing me'!

Having heard these cries, early in the morning he asked the people of the town: Good people, what is this in the bamboo grove here? Who is the woman that cries (there)?

And they said: Every night the sound of these cries is heard there in the grove. But every one is afraid to go and find what it is.

Then Purandara returned to his own city, and went to see the king.

And the king asked him: Purandara, what noteworthy thing hast thou seen while traveling in foreign parts?

Then Purandara told the king the story of the bamboo grove. And hearing of this strange occurrence the king set out with him for that city. And hearing at night the sound of the woman's wailing in the bamboo grove he went into the grove, and saw a *rākṣasa* in the act of murdering a helpless woman, who was screaming in extreme terror.

(Short Recension.)

Then going along the road he came to a certain town. There was a certain grove. In it a lone woman cried by night: Let some one save me!

Hearing this he asked the people of the place. Then the people replied: There a certain *rākṣasa* is devouring a woman. Her cries are constantly heard. But no one knows what it is (! *Reading uncertain and corrupt*).

Having seen this the merchant's son went back again to his own city, and told the king the occurrence.

Then the king took his shield and his sword and went forth with him. And he came to that city. Then at night, hearing the woman's cries in that grove, he took his sword (? *corrupt*) and went forth. There a *rākṣasa* was causing the woman to cry out (!).

(Jainistic Recension.)

And as he wandered he came to a city near Mount Malaya (! *a confusion between this mountain, in Malabar, and the Himālaya (Himācala) of the Southern version has occurred. Which was the original?*). And there he heard at night the call of some woman crying in distress with a piteous cry. And in the morning he asked the people.

And they said: We know not: every night some woman cries there: and therefore our city is greatly afraid, fearing some disaster. Having heard these things Purandara told the king. And the king out of curiosity went to that city.

(Southern Recension.)

And he said: Thou wretch, why dost thou kill a helpless woman?

And the *rākṣasa* said: What is that to thee? Go thine own way, or thou shalt die a useless death at my hands.

Then they fought, and the *rākṣasa* was killed by the king.

Then the woman came and fell at the king's feet and said: My lord, by thy grace I am released from a curse: thou hast brought me out of a great ocean of misery.

And the king said: Who art thou?

And she replied: Listen! In this very city there was an extremely rich Brahmin. His wife was I: but I was wanton and cared nothing for him, although he had a great affection for me. And I, having overweening pride in my beauty and charms, would not come when he bade me lie with him. Therefore, having been tormented with love all his life, at the time of his death my husband cursed me, saying:

(Short Recension.)

Then they two fought, and the *rākṣasa* was killed by the king.

Then the woman said to the king: O king, by thy grace I have escaped from (the consequences of) my (evil) deeds.

The king said: Who art thou?

She said: I was the wife of a certain Brahmin in this city. In the lustfulness of youth I deceived my husband. Then at the time of his death my husband cursed me (saying):

(Jainistic Recension.)

And at night he put on his sword and took his stand in the grove (? '*velā-vane*', prob. corrupt: read '*veṇuvane*', as Southern?). And when he heard the woman's cries he went in that direction, and saw a *rākṣasa* of fearful aspect beating a woman with blows of a whip.

And being filled with compassion the king said: Ho there, accursed *rākṣasa*! Why dost thou murder a woman? If there is any strength in thy arm, then fight with me!

Then in the fight between the two the *rākṣasa* was slain by the king.

And when she saw him (*sic*! '*tañ*', where '*tad*' would be more natural) the woman gave thanks to the king, (saying): Hail, hero of heroes! by thy grace I am become happy.

Then the king said: Lady, who art thou?

And she said: I was the wife of a Brahmin. And my husband was deeply devoted to me, but in spite of all he could do I liked him not.

(Southern Recension.)

Thou wicked and perverse woman! Since all my life I have been tormented because of thee, accordingly as long as thou livest a hideous *rākṣasa* that lives in the bamboo grove shall come and enjoy thee, much against thy will, every night, and shall slay thee. Thus he cursed me. But I prayed for a release from the curse, (saying): Nay, my lord, grant a release from the curse! And he said: When some man endowed with great valor and devoted to the service of others shall come hither and kill the *rākṣasa*, then shalt thou be freed from thy curse. Thus have I been freed from the curse through thee. I, now, am at the point of death: but I have nine jars of gold, which will be wasted. Do thou take them!

So speaking she told the king the place where the gold was: and her life left her. But the king gave the nine jars full of riches to the merchant Purandara, and returned with him to Ujjayinī.

Having told this story the statue said to the king: O king, if such nobility and valor are found in thee, then mount upon this throne!

And hearing this the king was silent.

(Short Recension.)

A *rākṣasa* of like appearance (with me? *cf. the Jain. text: but our text is here corrupt*) shall slay thee by night. Afterwards he granted a favor (saying): When some man shall kill the *rākṣasa*, then (shall be) thy release. Now then do thou take (these) nine jars of treasure.

The king said: One must not accept a gift from a woman.

She said: Thou hast saved my life: therefore do thou enjoy them.

Then the king gave the treasure to the merchant and returned to (his own) city.

O king, whosoever has such nobility, let him mount (this throne).

(Jainistic Recension.)

And from grief over this he died, and becoming a *rākṣasa* he came to me every night, out of ancient hate, and would beat me. Therefore am I today become happy through thy kindness; my persecution is at an end. And what favor can I, a weak woman, do in return for thee, great hero that thou art? Nevertheless, there is no one left in our family line: and I have nine jars of gold. Do thou take them. That which I give thee is a mere trifle altogether.

Then the king, just for amusement's sake (! '*līlayāiva*': *corrupt?*), gave this treasure to Purandara, and returned to his own city.

Therefore, O King, if such nobility is found in thee, then do thou mount upon this throne!

FRANKLIN EDGERTON.